Educational Leadership Measurement Tools Workgroup

Educator Effectiveness Project Jordan Auxiliary Services Building MINUTES December 9, 2011: Meeting #3

Present: Dixie Allen, Ann Anderson, Sol V. Garcia, Jay Blain, Scott Bushnell, Kim Baker, Vicci Gappmayer, Richard Holmes, Suzanne Cottrell, Brian Dawes, Stephen Dimond, Lee Gagon, Patrick Garcia, Barry Graff, Morgan Murdock, Kerrie Naylor, Greg Proffit, Mike Smith

Excused: Bob Gentry, Betty Barnum, Jane Ann Bitton, Ken Rowley, Steve Laing, Andrea Rorror, Tod Johnson, Jeannie Rowland

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kerrie

- Roll, travel vouchers, notebooks, etc.
- Review Minutes from Nov. 17, 2011 Meeting #2

Minutes were moved and seconded by Kim Baker and Greg Proffit. Minutes were approved as written with one spelling change.

- Review Agenda
- Goals for Today

The goals for today were to analyze our stakeholders and develop design criteria or parameters for our educational leadership evaluation tools.

2. Review Focus for the Workgroup

Suzanne

- Charges
- What we will do and not do

Suzanne presented a PPT with additional information regarding the charges for the workgroup. <u>The PPT is attached to the minutes.</u>

3. Stakeholder Analysis

Kerrie

- Who are our stakeholders
- What are they expecting (value offerings)

Workgroup members identified their stakeholders for the work of developing an educational leadership evaluation model. The notes from the stakeholder analysis are attached.

In addition, the group identified "value offerings" or reasons why our stakeholders would choose to use the product or service that is created by our workgroup. <u>These value offerings are also attached.</u> Members were reminded that these value offerings may be important as we develop design criteria and make decisions regarding the model that is developed.

4. Educational Leadership Evaluation Model Design Parameters

Mike Smith

- What are the design parameters that will lead us to the following:
 - i. Meaningful evaluation tools
 - ii. Measureable evaluation tools
 - iii. Applicable evaluation tools

Mike Smith facilitated the discussion about design criteria. He asked the group to divide into five groups of three people each to discuss what parameters we will use to meet the value offerings decided in the previous exercise. The following questions were asked:

- What principles will be adhered to?
- What will we deliver?
- What will we not deliver?

The results of this discussion and the workgroup's final design criteria are attached.

5. Reports from Six Teams on State Evaluation Models

Suzanne

- What did we identify on the matrix
- How do these models fit with our "design parameters"

After lunch the six groups assigned to investigate other states' evaluation systems reported out. Suzanne asked the groups to use the design criteria to share with the entire workgroup in what ways their state's tool meets our design criteria. These notes are also attached to the minutes. The following states were investigated:

- Delaware
- Iowa
- New Mexico
- North Carolina
- Ohio
- South Carolina

It was decided to look at the details of the Iowa evaluation system next time.

6. Other States' Models Kerrie and Suzanne

Colorado and R.I. will also be reviewed at the next meeting. <u>Members may wish to search on line for other states they wish to investigate.</u>

7. What's next? Kerrie

Articles for Next Time

The following three articles were distributed in the packets. <u>Members were asked to read these articles as background information for next time.</u>

- Measuring Principal Performance: How Rigorous are Commonly Used Principal Performance
 Assessment Instruments by Christopher Condon and Matthew Clifford
- Hiring Quality School Leaders: Challenges and Emerging Practices by Matthew Clifford
- State-Level Principal Performance Management Scorecard distributed by the American Institutes for Research
- Timeline for Work

Kerrie reviewed the timeline and charges for the group. The timeline is attached.

8. Closing Comments and Wrap-up

Suzanne

Suzanne closed the group by asking members to rate on a scale of 1-5 how doable they believe this work is according to the timeline distributed. Every member voted a 4 or 5 on the scale of do - ability.

9. Next Meeting: January 12, 2012, Utah Law and Justice Center, 645 S. 200 East, 9-3:00

Other Meeting Times:

Jan. 26: JSD, ASB, 9-3:00Feb. 9: JSD, ASB, 9-3:00

• Feb. 23: TBD. 9-3:00

• March 13: North and South Board Rooms, USOE, 9-3:00

Lunch will be provided at noon. Thank you for your participation. Minutes will be sent electronically.

Educational Leadership Measurement Tools Workgroup: December 9, 2011 <u>Stakeholder Analysis, Value Offerings, and Design Criteria</u> NOTES from the Discussion

The following <u>stakeholders</u> were identified (not in any particular order):

Students and parents

Administrators

Community and businesses

Politicians

Faculty and staff

Higher education preparation program faculty

Higher education students to be college and career ready

Central office LEAs

USOE/USBE

Local school boards

Joint educator evaluation committees

UEA and administrator associations

The group narrowed the list to the following <u>three stakeholder groups</u> that need to be considered when creating our evaluation model (in priority order):

- 1. LEA Central Office (to implement the system)
- 2. Administrators in the practice of the educational leadership (as change agents in the schools)
- 3. Utah State Board of Education and USOE administration (for accountability purposes)

The following <u>value offerings</u> (why our model would be chosen) by stakeholder groups were identified by three workgroups:

1. LEA Central Office (to implement the system): Why would LEA Central Office select our model?

Ease of the model - I don't have to create one the works at my place

Flexibility of the model – It can be changed to fit my needs easily

Cost of the model – or lack thereof

Convenience – we don't' have to do a lot of extra work

Time saved because 1) District doesn't have to develop, and 2) Instrument does not take a lot of time implementing

Adaptability – District, school, size, etc.

Compliance of the model to legislative or board policy

Professional Growth model for the administrator who is being evaluated

Valid, reliable, and effective

2. Administrators in the practice of the educational leadership (as change agents in the schools): Why would practicing administrators in school buildings accept our model?

Fairness – valid, consistent, simple but comprehensive (not cumbersome or overwhelming) it is complete, has a rubric – to increase accuracy

It is a process, ongoing, with goals (personal and professional). Multiple observation opportunities, balanced evaluation, opportunity for administrator to provide evidence, opportunity for professional development

School Growth – implementation (how do I do school improvement plan, Trustlands, use, accreditation, etc.) and student achievement. It represents many separate roles, (i.e., management of school, school discipline, community interactions). It has a goal setting component that looks at high expectations for high achievement. The instrument speaks to all of the aspects of being an administrator – to focus on continuous school improvement

3. Utah State Board of Education and USOE administration (for accountability purposes): Why would the State Board of Education and the State Office Staff accept our model?

Facilitates a comparison /contrast (within a range) of administrator leaders throughout the state - consistency

It identifies areas for administrative instructional programs to be improved for higher education preparation programs

Able to determine if leaders are the cause or a factor in failing schools

Provide an opportunity for professional growth and/or remediation for administrators across the state

<u>Design Criteria</u> as agreed to by the workgroup: **List the parameters or design criteria that should guide our** decision making about the ideal educational leadership evaluation design.

The following questions guided the three groups' discussion of design criteria growing out of the value offerings. Information generated by the groups is recorded below.

What principles should guide our thinking about educational leadership evaluation?

PRINCIPLES

- Flexible for districts
- Professional development
- · Benchmarks indentified by ratings with rubric consistency
- Provide for professional growth and /or remediation (with due process)
- Comparable, fair, valid, reliable
- School growth
- Improve instructional quality and student achievement
- Manager of learning and building
- Guidance on leader delegation
- Must work for building and DO administrators
- Must include multiple data points
- Must be comprehensive and cover all critical aspects of the job
- Must be designed to improve the administrator
- Must include multiple measures (variety)
- Must be valid and reliable across multiple domains and uses
- Must be doable, reasonable in application
- Must not be an unnecessary administrative burden
- Validity through state standards

What must the evaluation design do or deliver?

DO-SHALL BE

- Offers professional growth opportunities
- Simplicity and ease
- Fairness
- Multiple Sources of Input (growth and improvement)
- Options to measure tracking and growth (longitudinal and statewide consistency)
- Provides flexibility with range of district need and size

What must the evaluation design <u>not do</u> or not deliver?

DOES NOT DO - SHALL NOT BE

- Cost burden
- Administrator burden
- Time consuming
- A set up for failure
- Isolated snapshot in one year
- Inconsistent and unfair
- Give too much emphasis or weight to building management instead of priority to instructional leader

The group noticed the overlap and reoccurring themes within the groups' efforts, so they combined, clarified, and adjusted the large list down to the following in order to identify the design criteria priorities of the workgroup. (The members of the workgroup were then asked to each place 8 votes on the criteria that they believed held the most weight and were of highest importance to consider when designing the evaluation tools.) The number of votes each received is listed as well.

- Benchmarks indentified by ratings with rubric consistency= 15
- Provide for professional growth and /or remediation (with due process)= 19
- School growth (SIP process)= 0
- Improve instructional quality and student achievement= 12
- Must work for building and DO administrators= 18
- Must include multiple data points= 3
- Must be comprehensive and cover all critical aspects of the job= 10
- Must include multiple measures (variety)= 8
- Must be valid and reliable across multiple domains and uses= 9
- Must be doable, reasonable in application= 9
- Validity through state standards= 3
- Options to measure tracking and growth (longitudinal and statewide consistency)= 6
- Provides flexibility with range of district need and size= 9
- Not be a cost burden= 7
- Not be a set up for failure and needs to be positive= 0
- Not give too much emphasis or weight to building management instead of priority to instructional leader= 18

The group then reviewed the prioritization to see if something was missing or confusing. From that, the following 10 design criteria were identified with the following number of votes:

#	Overall Criteria: Must reflect and meet the state leadership standards
1	Must provide professional growth and/or remediation for due process 19
2	Must work for building and district office administrators 18
3	Must includes benchmarks and demarcation of ratings 15
4	Must improve instructional quality and student achievement through effective educational leadership 12
5	Must be comprehensive and cover all critical aspects of the job 10
6	Must be valid and reliable across multiple domains, uses, etc. 9
7	Must be instruments designed to be used as a process - not intended to be a single snapshot of the practice 9
8	Must be doable and reasonable in application – not an unnecessary administrative burden or cost burden 9

9	Must provide flexibility with applicability for a range of districts' needs and sizes 8
10	Must include multiple measures—to include observations, student/parent input surveys, etc. 8

Notes on State models that match or not match our design criteria